

Basic schools developed their own school education programmes in compliance with FEP and with the exception of 5th grades schools taught according to them in all grades. The CSI positively evaluated a year-on-year improvement of the quality of SEPs in basic schools. However, SEPs with identified risks (lack of compliance with FEP BE), at least in one of the monitored indicators, were revealed in 38.5 % of schools. SEPs in special basic schools were considerably better since only 26.8 % of SEPs displayed inconsistencies with FEP for special basic schools.

The key priority of the 2007 Long-term Policy Objectives was to support inclusive education. Further development was specified in a strategic document known as the National Action Plan of Inclusive Education, drawn up in compliance with Czech Government Resolution No. 206 of 15 March 2010 concerning the proposal of the preparatory phase of the National Action Plan of Inclusive Education.

The table below summarises results of comparative analyses of compliance between SEPs and FEP BE.

Table 27 Evaluation of compliance of sections of SEPs with FEP BE in the basic schools visited

Sections of SEP	2009/2010		2010/2011		Trend
	Compliance	Non-compliance	Compliance	Non-compliance	
School description in SEP	73.3	26.7	88.8	11.2	+
Description of SEP	61.0	39.0	74.7	25.3	+
Curriculum	65.4	34.6	70.5	29.5	+
Syllabus	62.4	37.6	67.2	32.8	+
Rules for evaluation of pupils	71.6	28.4	67.0	33.0	-
School self-evaluation	66.6	33.4	73.9	26.1	+

Schools were the best when defining school and educational strategies. SEPs were correctly oriented towards the goals of education under the Education Act while taking account of support for development of the personality of pupils and they also considered the goals encompassed in FEP well (98.5 % of SEPs).

Deficiencies persisted in the provision of education to pupils with SEN (18.0 % of SEPs). Nor did schools know how to draw up strategies for socially disadvantaged pupils. Improvement achieved in comparison with the last school year indicated a positive impact of a new legislative regulation in which the above categories were better defined. Schools had problems with the development of curricula (18.6 % of SEPs) as they did not correctly specify the content, timetable and organisational definitions of the subject matter of their curricula or cross-curricular topics (by making themes and activities more concrete). There was still a very high proportion of schools which have not yet correctly elaborated rules for the evaluation of pupils; problems persisted also in the setting of criteria for the assessment of pupils (15.9 % of SEPs) and of self-evaluation criteria (16.3 % of SEPs).

For more details on SEPs see Part B, Tables B 5 and B 6.